

WATER STREET SALOONS DISCUSSED

At Hearing on Bill to Give County Commissioners Discretionary Licensing Powers

NORWICH CITIZENS SPEAK IN FAVOR

Seven Liquor Dealers Would be Forced Out of Business Under Present Law, After an Era of No-License—"Keep Saloons in Water Street," Keynote of Arguments of Bill's Advocates—Some Opposition.

(Special to The Bulletin.)

Hartford, April 4.—Senator Avery's bill concerning the granting of liquor licenses, in effect giving to county commissioners a discretionary power to grant licenses within 200 feet of a church, school or other building that

This view was also coincided in by Judge Ayling, Judge Barnes and Mr. Pratt, who all agreed that the county commissioners are very careful as to whom and where they grant licenses, and that it would be safe to entrust discretionary powers to them in this

as so protected under the present law, was heard by the excise committee Tuesday afternoon, with prominent Norwich citizens appearing in favor of the measure, and with the Water street section of Norwich much under discussion.

Present Law Affects Seven Norwich Saloons.

The object of the bill is to broaden the powers of the commissioners, they having no power under the present law to grant a license within the 200 foot limit, even though there should be no

the lines of the bill under consideration. Mr. Spooner said he was familiar with conditions in Norwich, but those conditions were not the same in every other license town in the state. The committee should not consider the interests of seven men in the liquor business in Norwich and legislate for

opposition to their doing so. From all that was said by the Norwich men it was to be understood that the present law, should their city vote no license and later again vote license, would drive seven saloons in the Water street section out of business, because of

their proximity to Trinity M. E. church, and incidentally greatly reduce the value of property in that street now used for saloons. The committee was also told that the sentiment in Norwich will have to go, anyway. He knew that Norwich was peculiarly situated as to the matter under discussion, but what was wanted there would not be good for the state, as a general proposition.

Former Norwich Man Opposed.

O. E. Ryther, formerly of Norwich, thirteen years a resident there, was also heard in opposition. He spoke of three other sections of Norwich relative to the matter under consideration. With reference to Water street, however, he said that thousands of

tion from a legal standpoint, after reviewing the various changes in the laws relative to the matter under consideration.

Under the present law, Mr. Comstock said, the county commissioners have absolutely no discretion as to whether or not they will allow a picture show, and that the theater was in close proximity to the Water street saloons. At Trutville, Mr. Ryther said, school children are obliged to run a gauntlet of saloons on their way to school, and this was made an

granting a license when 200 voters in buildings covered by the law, after a town has voted license. The pith of what the speaker afterwards said to the committee was that it would be desirable to allow the commissioners discretionary powers in this respect. In New London county the commissioners in the last election, with the result that the Taftville district voted for no license by a majority of three. He also spoke of the Falls section and of Franklin street, criticizing briefly.

Opposed by Hartford Clergyman.
Page 26. A. Sullivan of Hartford

sloners are careful in the extreme that no license shall be granted in an undesirable place, even though such a place be more than 200 feet from a church, school or other building covered by the law. The present law makes all territory within the 200 foot

Pratt Tells of Danger to Water Street Saloons.

George H. Pratt, who said he had been in the liquor business in Norwich for many years, brought a map of that part of the city about Main

On this part of the matter, associations and Water streets, that the committee might get a better idea of just how the present law would affect the dealers in that section in case Norwich votes no license. He said the places of seven liquor dealers in Norwich, all within 200 feet of Trinity M. E. church, will be under consideration *and* now, and the present law repealed. A few Norwich men might suffer, but to reject the bill would be for the best interests of thousands and thousands of people throughout the state.

South Manchester Man Against It.

situated on Main street, sixty feet above Water street, would be closed because of being within the 200 foot limit in such a case, although there is no general objection to the saloons remaining there, where they have been located for years and years. Mr. Pratt

said that in case of a no license vote in Norwich he could not under the present law, after Norwich again voted license, go back there and again do a liquor business, and in such an event he would feel that his property would not be worth more than 50 cents on the dollar, of the present valuation.

Mr. Pratt said that the Water street saloons were no more of a detriment to the church than if they were forty miles away. He said he did not want a law that would cause his property to be reduced in value by a little flop-over on the license question.

Judge Barnes Favored Bill.
Judge John Barnes of Norwich also talked in favor of the bill advocated by the other Norwich gentlemen.

Judge Ayling Also in Favor.
Judge Nelson J. Ayling said that

Rome, April 4.—The attempt by a man who is undoubtedly innocent against the canons during the service in St. Peter's today caused great alarm for a time, particularly after it became known that he originally had designs against the pope. After he had been

Norwich is peculiarly circumstanced with reference to this particular law. In discussing the relation of Main and Water streets he said that they were diametrically opposed as to trade conditions, as different as is Cairo from Boston. It had been the policy of city authorities to keep the streets as straight as possible, and the result was that the streets were straight as an arrow, and the result was that the streets were straight as an arrow, and the result was that the streets were straight as an arrow.

leons in Water street, which is largely given over to that purpose, and no one in Norwich objects to the street being used for that purpose. The section is under the eye of the police. In favor of the passage of the bill, Judge Ayling told the committee that should the sa-

be driven out of Water street through the operation of the present law, they would likely percolate through sections of the city where they are not wanted. Judge Ayling said he believed he voiced the general sentiment of the people of Norwich

When he said, if they are to have saloons, they would prefer them as at present located.

Water Street the Place for Saloons.

Henry W. Tibbits said the police department felt that if liquor is to be sold, Water street is the place, as do

**WOMAN SUFFRAGE VOTED
DOWN IN MASSACHUSETTS**

**House Rejects Motion to Substitute by
Vote of 161 to 69.**

the county commissioners, who have cleaned up Franklin square. The dealers in that section keep well within the law. The section is as little of a nuisance to Main street as if it were twenty miles away. It is only just and right that the men doing a business near the Water street should

Sheriff Rouse Favors Bill.
George W. Rouse, city sheriff, in response to questions by Mr. Comstock, said he had known the Water street section for years, and that the sa-

loons there are conducted in an orderly manner. He said he knew of no better place for the saloons than in that section. He favored a law that would place within the power of the county commissioners the right to grant licenses to those places in case a

Senator Avery Also For It.
Senator Avery said that Water street was the most suitable place in the city for granting licenses. He believed that the county commission-

ers should be allowed discretionary powers as to granting licenses, subject on appeal to review by the superior court, this in response to a question by Mr. Comstock.